

Application No.: 09/857,904

Docket No.: 19036/37471

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that the above amendment to claim 6 places all remaining claims 6-19 in condition for allowance and, therefore, should be entered.

Claim 6 has been amended to remove the "and" in line 5. Therefore, the objection to claim 6 should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is submitted that the amendments to claim 6, together with the detailed description as originally filed, overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The term "without the lubricant through an area which is smaller than the cut area having apertures formed therein within the composite sheet with the first slit" finds clear support at pages 5 and 6 of the specification, as follows:

Page 5, lines 9-13:

"the lid member is further characterized in that the surface sheet 11 is adhered to the composite sheet 1 at the opening area C without the lubricant through an area (not shown) which is smaller than cut area which form apertures made within the composite sheet 1 with the first slit 7."

Page 12, lines 6-12:

"Further, the surface sheet 11 is adhered to the composite sheet 1 at the opening area C without the lubricant through an area (not shown in Fig. 1) which is smaller than the cut area which forms apertures in the composite sheet 1 with the first slit 7. As an adhesion area, any area which is smaller than the cut area by the first slit 7 is applicable, and it may include circular cut area of inner diameter  $r$  as shown in Fig. 3 (A), or area formed in the form of a pattern like a dot-pattern or, besides the combination of such area, crosswise form or the like."

See also page 6, lines 6-11 for the preferred difference between the cut area in the surface sheet formed with the first slit, *e.g.*, having radius  $R$  versus the cut area in the composite sheet, *e.g.*, having radius  $r$ .

Application No.: 09/857,904

Docket No.: 19036/37471

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-19 stand further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite based on insufficient antecedent basis for "the cut area" in claim 6, line 12. Claim 6 has been amended to substitute "the" with -- a --. The cut area, *e.g.*, having radius "R" formed in the surface sheet by the first slit is adhered to the composite sheet over a smaller area, *e.g.*, defined by radius "r", where no lubricant is placed, as explained above. The claim language is now clear and the antecedent basis rejection should be withdrawn.

The claim language "said easily peelable layer" in claim 6, line 14 also has been given antecedent basis by inserting "comprising an easily peelable layer" in line 4. Accordingly, the rejection based on this claim language should be withdrawn.

The claimed feature in claim 6, line 7 leading to the Examiner's query: "how can a first slit form a plurality of apertures" is explained at page 11, lines 13-19, as follows:

"Opening area C has a first slit 7 which cut the composite sheet 1 vertical-sectionally and form the apertures.

First slit 7 is entered with molded blades (clicking blades) onto back side (side where the surface sheet 11 is not laminated) of the composite sheet 1, then, when the surface sheet in the easily-peelable area A is peeled, a part of the composite sheets sectioned with the circular first slit 7 are removed together with the surface sheet 11 adhered therewith."

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 based on the language at line 7, which is clearly explained in the specification, should be withdrawn.

The claimed feature "without the lubricant through an area which is smaller than the cut area having apertures therein within the composite sheet with the first slit" is explained above with reference to the radii "R" and "r", as clearly explained above. There is no contradiction in claim 6 at lines 4 and lines 11 and 12. Accordingly, it is submitted that this rejection also should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 09/857,904

Docket No.: 19036/37471

It is submitted that all claims are now of proper form and scope for allowance.  
Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due,  
please charge our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 19036/37471 from which  
the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard H. Anderson

Richard H. Anderson

Registration No.: 26,526

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant